

REMARKS

The present application was filed on March 16, 2004 with claims 1-31. Claims 1-31 remain pending, and claims 1, 16, and 31 are the pending independent claims.

The specification is objected to as failing to provide antecedent basis for “machine readable medium” as recited in claim 31.

Claims 1-6, 9, 11, 12, 16-21, 24, 26, 27 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0161763 (hereinafter “Ye”) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0107858 (hereinafter “Lundahl”) and U.S. Patent No. 7,227,985 (hereinafter “Ikeda”).

Claims 7, 10, 22, and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ye, Lundahl and Ikeda in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,625,585 (hereinafter “MacCuish”).

Claims 8, 13-15, 23, and 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ye, Lundahl and Ikeda in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0098617 (hereinafter “Sekar”).

Claim 1 has been amended to include certain limitations of claims 2-4, canceled herein, and claim 16 has been amended to include certain limitations of claims 17-19, canceled herein. Claims 1 and 16 have also been amended to include further limitations which are supported by the present specification at, for example, page 10, lines 15-20, and page 10, line 26, to page 11, line 2.

Specifically, claims 1 and 16 have been amended to include limitations wherein creating one or more clusters further comprises: computing one or more similarity values for a given object relating to one or more existing clusters; determining a closest cluster for the object based on the one or more similarity values; determining whether the similarity value for the object relating to the closest cluster is greater than a threshold; responsive to a determination that the similarity value is greater than the threshold, adding the object to the closest cluster and updating the statistical data of the closest cluster; responsive to a determination that the similarity value is not greater than the threshold, determining whether there is at least one cluster to which no object has been added within a given period of time; responsive to a determination that there is no cluster to which at least no object has been added within the given period of time, adding the object to the closest cluster and

Attorney Docket No. YOR920040039US1

updating the statistical data of the closest cluster; and responsive to a determination that there is at least one cluster to which no object has been added within the given period of time, replacing the cluster to which no object has been added within the longest period of time with a new cluster comprising the object and generating statistical data of the new cluster.

The cancellation of claim 31 overcomes the present objection.

With regard to the §103 rejections, it is believed that the references of record fail to teach or suggest every limitation of independent claims 1 and 16 as amended.

Dependent claims 5-15 and 20-30 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency from claims 1 and 16. Furthermore, these claims are believed to define separately patentable subject matter.

In view of the above, Applicants believe that claims 1, 5-16 and 20-30 are in condition for allowance, and respectfully request withdrawal of the §103(a) rejections and objection.

Respectfully submitted,



William E. Lewis
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 39,274
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP
90 Forest Avenue
Locust Valley, NY 11560
(516) 759-2946

Date: June 17, 2008